

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending and have been examined in the present application. Claims 1-44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Brauns, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,381,555). Claims 1-44 have additionally been rejected under Section 103 over Barton, III, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,381). In light of the below remarks, reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-44 have been rejected under Section 103 over Brauns, et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Independent claim 1 requires “storing respective financial performance data for each of a plurality of securities, each security underlying one of a plurality of structured security transactions sold by issuers to investors.” Applicants respectfully submit that Brauns neither teaches nor suggests this explicit limitation of independent claim 1 nor any of the other limitations of claim 1 related to financial performance data for the securities.

Brauns merely describes a relational database spreadsheet program that contains performance data of publicly traded corporations. The only types of performance data provided in Brauns is “gross operating revenues, extraordinary items, cost of goods sold, overhead and profit.” (Column 2, lines 46-47.) Brauns is completely silent with respect to financial performance of a security, let alone securities that underlie a structured security transaction.

Claim 1 further requires that “at least some of the subset of financial performance data being arranged in a time series.” Brauns is absolutely devoid of any teaching or suggesting of arranging any of its data in a time series. Brauns does

disclose storing the time period associated with the particular data (e.g., a fiscal quarter or fiscal year) but this merely provides a time stamp for the static snapshot of the data stored in Brauns spreadsheet. Again, Brauns does not disclose arranging its data in a time series as explicitly required by independent claim 1. As Braun does not show using financial performance data of securities that underlie structured security transactions and it does not show arranging the security financial performance data in a time series, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-44 on the basis of Brauns is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-44 have further been rejected under Section 103 over Barton, III, et al., Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As stated above, claim 1 requires storing financial performance data for a plurality of securities. Although Barton does disclose placing information with respect to securities in a database, nowhere does it teach or suggest storing financial performance data of the securities. It furthermore does not disclose storing the financial performance data for securities that underlie a structured security transaction. Finally, it clearly does not teach or suggest arranging a subset of the financial performance data in a time series as explicitly required by claim 1. As Barton does not disclose or suggest any of these limitations as explicitly required by independent claim 1, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-44 on the basis of Barton is respectfully requested.


Application No.: 09/470,180

Docket No.: J2167.0112/P112

As each of the claims of the present application are currently in condition for allowance, such action is earnestly solicited.

Dated: December 19, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Michael J. Scheer

Registration No.: 34,425
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas - 41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400
Attorneys for Applicants

MJS/mgs